arXiv:0907.1740v2 [math.RA] 15 Jul 2009

# THE TITS—KANTOR—KOECHER CONSTRUCTION FOR JORDAN DIALGEBRAS

V. YU. GUBAREV[1] AND P. S. KOLESNIKOV[2*]

Abstract. We study a noncommutative generalization of Jordan algebras called Leibniz—Jordan algebras. These algebras satisfy the identities $[x_1x_2]x_3 = 0$, $(x_1^2, x_2, x_3) = 2(x_1, x_2, x_1x_3)$, $x_1(x_1^2x_2) = x_1^2(x_1x_2)$; they are related with Jordan algebras in the same way as Leibniz algebras are related to Lie algebras. We present an analogue of the Tits—Kantor—Koecher construction for Leibniz—Jordan algebras that provides an embedding of such an algebra into Leibniz algebra.

## 1. Introduction

Leibniz algebras are the most investigated non-commutative analogues of Lie algebras. A (left) Leibniz algebra $L$ is a linear space endowed with bilinear operation $[\cdot,\cdot] : L\times L \to L$ that satisfies (left) Leibniz identity

$$[x,[y,z]] = [[x,y],z] + [y,[x,z]]. \tag{1}$$

This is well-known that an arbitrary Lie algebra $L$ can be embedded into an appropriate associative algebra $A$ assuming the Lie bracket on $L$ coincides with the commutator on $A$. To get a similar embedding for Leibniz algebras, J.-L. Loday and T. Pirashvili in [18] proposed the notion of an (associative) dialgebra as a substitute for the class of associative algebras. By definition, an associative dialgebra $D$ is a linear space endowed with two bilinear operations $\dashv, \vdash$: $D \times D \to D$ that satisfy certain axioms. In particular, the "di-commutator" $[x, y] = x \vdash y - y \dashv x$ satisfies (1).

Another class of dialgebras (alternative ones) appeared in [14]. It is also motivated by Leibniz algebras, namely, the alternativity condition appears as a necessary and sufficient condition for embedding a (non-associative) dialgebra $D$ into the Steinberg Leibniz algebra $\mathrm{stl}_3(D)$, which is a non-commutative analogue of the result from [6].

In [11], the natural relation between dialgebras and conformal algebras was found. Conformal algebras were introduced in [8] as a tool for investigating vertex algebras. Since that, the theory of conformal algebras and their generalizations (pseudo-algebras [2]) has been separated as an independent research area. By definition, a pseudo-algebra $C$ is a module over a cocommutative Hopf algebra $H$ endowed with an $H$-bilinear map $* : C \otimes C \to (H \otimes H) \otimes_H C$ called pseudo-product. A general categorical approach of [5] allows to define what is an associative (Lie, alternative, Jordan, etc.) pseudo-algebra.

Pseudo-algebras are related to dialgebras in the following way: there exists a functor from the category of pseudo-algebras to the category of (non-associative) dialgebras.

Under this functor, associative (alternative) pseudo-algebras turn into associative (alternative) dialgebras, Lie pseudo-algebras turn into Leibniz algebras. This is a reason to define what is a variety Var of dialgebras, where Var is a homogeneous variety of ordinary algebras defined by a family of poly-linear identities.

Conversely, an arbitrary Var dialgebra can be embedded into an appropriate Var pseudo-algebra over $H$ provided that $H$ contains a non-zero primitive element.

This is natural to expect that if we start with an associative dialgebra $D$ and define new operation

$$x \circ y = x \vdash y + y \dashv x, \quad x, y \in D,$$

then the algebra $(D, \circ)$ obtained would be representative of a class of non-associative algebras that relates to the class of Jordan algebras in the same way as Leibniz algebras relate to Lie algebras. This idea was implemented in [21] (where these algebras were called quasi-Jordan algebras). However, the adequate formalization of the class of algebras obtained in this way should involve one more identity, as we show in this work. We introduce the correct notion of the variety of Jordan dialgebras (or Leibniz—Jordan algebras) which is a subvariety of quasi-Jordan algebras from [21]. The same notion is also proposed in [4].

There are several approaches that lead to the same notion of Leibniz—Jordan algebras: The construction of [21], the operadic approach related to conformal algebras [11], and the "representational" one of [20].

In Section 2, we state all necessary definitions and notations related with conformal algebras. In the exposition, we follow [2] and [8], however, the axioms of conformal algebras are adjusted for nonzero characteristic of the ground field.

In Section 3, it is shown how to assign a variety of dialgebras to an arbitrary variety of ordinary algebras [20]. Here we also study the relations between dialgebras and conformal algebras. In particular, we prove that an arbitrary dialgebra can be embedded into a current conformal algebra (which strengthen the result of [11]). This embedding allows to join a bar-unit to an arbitrary dialgebra of a class $\mathfrak{M}$ if the corresponding class of ordinary algebras admits joining a unit. For associative and alternative dialgebras it was shown in [20].

Solvability and nilpotency of Jordan dialgebras (or Leibniz—Jordan algebras) are studied in Section 4. It is shown that a finitely generated solvable Leibniz—Jordan algebra is nilpotent, as it happens for Jordan algebras [24]. Here we also state an analogue of the Pierce decomposition for Leibniz—Jordan algebras.

The main goal of this paper is to present an analogue of the Tits—Kantor—Koecher (TKK) construction for Leibniz—Jordan algebras that prospectively provides an embedding of such an algebra into a Leibniz algebra.

In Section 5 we build the main tool that is used to implement this construction: the notions of a di-endomorphism and a quasi-derivation. They are based on the embedding of a Jordan dialgebra into a Jordan conformal algebra.

Section 6 an analogue of the TKK construction for Leibniz—Jordan algebras is studied. Although a similar construction for conformal algebras (and their generalizations, pseudo-algebras) is known [23, 12], we can not use it directly since it is well-defined for finite pseudo-algebras only (corresponding to the case of finite-dimensional Leibniz—Jordan algebras).

To get rid the condition of finite dimension, we have to state the TKK construction independently of the conformal algebra case. However, the embedding of a Jordan dialgebra into a Jordan conformal algebra is still involved into consideration. But we will show that the Leibniz algebra obtained as TKK does not depend on the choice of such embedding, so we may choose the simplest one, i.e., the embedding into current conformal algebra built in Section 3. We also show that a Leibniz—Jordan algebra is nilpotent (or strongly solvable) if and only if is its TKK construction is nilpotent (or solvable).

## 2. Preliminaries on pseudo-algebras

2.1. **Pseudo-algebras over a Hopf algebra.** Let $H$ be a Hopf algebra (the main example we will use is the polynomial algebra $H = \Bbbk[T]$ with the canonical coproduct). Consider the class $H$-mod of left unital modules over the algebra $H$. Suppose $M_1, \dots, M_n, M \in H$-mod. Let us say that a $\Bbbk$-linear map

$$a : M_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes M_n \to H^{\otimes n} \otimes_H M \tag{2}$$

is $H^{\otimes n}$-linear if

$$a(h_1 x_1, \dots h_n x_n) = ((h_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes h_n) \otimes_H 1) a(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

for all $h_i \in H$, $x_i \in M_i$. Here the space $H^{\otimes n} = \underbrace{H \otimes \cdots \otimes H}_{n}$ is considered as the outer product of regular right $H$-modules.

The class $H$-mod is a pseudo-tensor category [3] (or multi-category in the sense of [13]) by means of the space of multi-morphisms $P_n^{H\text{-mod}}(M_1, \dots, M_n; M)$ defined as the space of all $H^{\otimes n}$-linear maps (2). The details on the composition of such maps can be found in [2] or [11]. This multi-category is symmetric provided that $H$ is cocommutative.

Given an operad $\mathcal{O}$, one may define an $\mathcal{O}$-algebra in $H$-mod in the usual way as a functor $\mathcal{O} \to H$-mod. In particular, if $\mathcal{O} = \mathrm{Alg}$, where Alg is the operad of binary trees (that corresponds to the variety of all non-associative algebras), then the pseudo-algebra structure is completely defined by $C \in H$-mod equipped with a map $* \in P_2^{H\text{-mod}}(C, C; C)$. This map (called pseudo-product) is the image of the elementary binary tree with two leaves. The pair $(C, *)$ is called a pseudo-algebra over $H$ [2].

In particular, if $\dim_{\Bbbk} H = 1$ then $H$-mod is just the multi-category of linear spaces, so the notion of a pseudo-algebra over $H$ coincides with the ordinary notion of an algebra over $\Bbbk$. If $H = \Bbbk[T]$, $\mathrm{char}\, \Bbbk = 0$, then pseudo-algebra over $H$ is the same as conformal algebra [8].

If Var is a homogeneous variety of algebras defined by a family of poly-linear identities, then let us denote the corresponding quotient operad of Alg by VarAlg. As in the

case of ordinary algebras (see, e.g., [5]), a pseudo-algebra $C$ over $H$ is said to be Var pseudo-algebra if the corresponding functor Alg $\to$ $H$-mod can be restricted to VarAlg. This approach allows to define associative, alternative, Lie, Jordan, and other classical varieties of pseudo-algebras defined by poly-linear identities. In [10], it was shown that for conformal algebras this definition agrees with the one from [19] that uses coefficient algebras.

2.2. **Current conformal algebras.** Let us call by "conformal algebras" all pseudo-algebras over $H = \Bbbk[T]$ without a restriction on $\operatorname{char}\Bbbk$.

Assume $H = \Bbbk[T]$. It is easy to see that $H \otimes H$ is a free right $H$-module with the basis $\{T^n \otimes 1\}_{n\geq 0}$. Therefore, for every conformal algebra $C$ and for all $a, b \in C$ there exists a unique expression

$$a * b = \sum_{n\geq 0} (T^n \otimes 1) \otimes_H c_n, \quad c_n \in C.$$

Let us denote $c_n$ by $a\ {}_{(n)}\ b$. Thus, the pseudo-product on $C$ is completely defined by a countable family of operations ${}_{(n)}\colon C \otimes C \to C$ such that for all $a, b \in C$ only a finite number of $a\ {}_{(n)}\ b$ is nonzero (locality property). Moreover, the condition of $H^{\otimes 2}$-linearity is equivalent to the following properties of these operations:

$$\begin{gathered} Ta\ {}_{(n)}\ b = a\ {}_{(n-1)}\ b,\ n \geq 1, \quad Ta\ {}_{(0)}\ b = 0, \\ T(a\ {}_{(n)}\ b) = a\ {}_{(n)}\ Tb + Ta\ {}_{(n)}\ b,\ n \geq 0, \end{gathered} \tag{3}$$

for all $a, b \in C$.

We will also use the following operations. Given $a, b \in C$, denote by $\{a * b\}$ the element $(\sigma_{12} \otimes_H \mathrm{id}_C)(a * b) \in H^{\otimes 2} \otimes_H C$, where $\sigma_{12}$ is the permutation of tensor factors in $H^{\otimes 2}$. Analogously,

$$\{a * b\} = \sum_{n\geq 0} (T^n \otimes 1) \otimes_H \{a\ {}_{(n)}\ b\},$$

where the operations $\{\cdot\ {}_{(n)}\ \cdot\}$ satisfy the following properties:

$$\begin{gathered} \{a\ {}_{(n)}\ Tb\} = \{a\ {}_{(n-1)}\ b\},\ n \geq 1, \quad \{a\ {}_{(0)}\ Tb\} = 0, \\ T\{a\ {}_{(n)}\ b\} = \{a\ {}_{(n)}\ Tb\} + \{Ta\ {}_{(n)}\ b\},\ n \geq 0. \end{gathered} \tag{4}$$

The simplest example of a conformal algebra can be constructed as follows. Suppose $A$ is an ordinary algebra, and consider the free $H$-module $C = H \otimes A$ equipped with the following pseudo-product:

$$(f \otimes a) * (h \otimes b) = (f \otimes h) \otimes_H (1 \otimes ab), \quad f, h \in H,\ a, b \in A.$$

In particular,

$$(1 \otimes a)\ {}_{(n)}\ (1 \otimes b) = \begin{cases} 1 \otimes ab, & n = 0, \\ 0, & n > 0. \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

Then $(C, *)$ is a conformal algebra denoted by $\operatorname{Cur} A$ (current conformal algebra). If $A$ belongs to a variety Var then $\operatorname{Cur} A$ is a Var conformal algebra.

2.3. **Conformal endomorphisms.** In the theory of ordinary algebras, an important role belongs to the associative algebra of linear transformations of a linear space. The corresponding construction for conformal algebras (and, more generally, pseudo-algebras) was proposed in [9] and [2]. In this subsection, we state all necessary definitions with a restriction to the case $H = \Bbbk[T]$.

Consider an $H$-module $M$. A conformal endomorphism $\varphi$ of $M$ is a linear map

$$\varphi : M \to (H \otimes H) \otimes_H M$$

such that $\varphi(hx) = ((1 \otimes h) \otimes_H 1)\varphi(x)$ for all $h \in H$, $x \in M$. The space of all conformal endomorphisms of $M$ is denoted by $\operatorname{Cend} M$.

It is easy to see that for every $\varphi \in \operatorname{Cend} M$ and for every $x \in M$ there exists a unique expression

$$\varphi(x) = \sum_{n \geq 0} (T^n \otimes 1) \otimes_H \varphi_n(x)$$

where $\varphi_n : M \to M$, $n \geq 0$, are $\Bbbk$-linear maps and

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_n(x) &= 0, \quad n \gg 0, \\ \varphi_n(Tx) &= T\varphi_n(x) - \varphi_{n-1}(x), \quad n \geq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

(hereinafter, we assume $\varphi_{-1} \equiv 0$). Hence, $\varphi \in \operatorname{Cend} M$ can be identified with a sequence of $\Bbbk$-linear maps $\varphi_n : M \to M$ such that (6) holds.

It is easy to check that if $\varphi \in \operatorname{Cend} M$, $x \in M$, then

$$\varphi_n(T^m x) = \sum_{s \geq 0} (-1)^s \binom{m}{s} T^{m-s} \varphi_{n-s}(x) \tag{7}$$

for all $n, m \geq 0$.

The space $\operatorname{Cend} M$ can be considered as a left $H$-module my means of $(T\varphi)_n = \varphi_{n-1}$ for all $\varphi \in \operatorname{Cend} M$, $n \geq 0$. This $H$-module can be equipped by operations ${}_{(n)}$: $\operatorname{Cend} M \otimes \operatorname{Cend} M \to \operatorname{Cend} M$ defined as follows:

$$(\varphi \ {}_{(n)} \ \psi)_m = \sum_{s=0}^{n} (-1)^s \binom{m+s}{s} \varphi_{n-s} \psi_{m+s}, \quad n, m \geq 0.$$

These operations on $\operatorname{Cend} M$ satisfy (3), but, in general, do not have the locality property. However, if $M$ is a finitely generated $H$-module then $\operatorname{Cend} M$ is an associative conformal algebra [2].

## 3. Dialgebras

3.1. **Associative and alternative dialgebras.** A linear space $A$ with two bilinear operations

$$\vdash, \dashv : A \times A \to A$$

is called a dialgebra. Various particular classes of dialgebras introduced in literature are motivated by their relations to Leibniz algebras. A dialgebra $A$ is associative [18] if it satisfies the identities

$$(x \dashv y) \vdash z = (x \vdash y) \vdash z, \quad x \dashv (y \vdash z) = x \dashv (y \dashv z), \tag{8}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (x,y,z)_{\vdash} &\equiv (x \vdash y) \vdash z - x \vdash (y \vdash z) = 0, \\ (x,y,z)_{\dashv} &\equiv (x \dashv y) \dashv z - x \dashv (y \dashv z) = 0, \\ (x,y,z)_{\times} &\equiv (x \vdash y) \dashv z - x \vdash (y \dashv z) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

This class of dialgebras is well investigated in [17]. Such dialgebras play the role of associative envelopes of Leibniz algebras: an associative dialgebra $A$ with respect to the operation

$$[a,b] = a \vdash b - b \dashv a, \quad a,b \in A,$$

satisfies (1). The Leibniz algebra obtained is denoted by $A^{(-)}$.

A dialgebra $A$ is said to be alternative [14] if it satisfies the identities (8) and

$$\begin{aligned} (x,y,z)_{\vdash} + (y,x,z)_{\vdash} = 0, \quad (x,y,z)_{\dashv} + (x,z,y)_{\dashv} = 0, \\ (x,y,z)_{\dashv} + (y,x,z)_{\times} = 0, \quad (x,y,z)_{\times} + (x,z,y)_{\vdash} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

These definitions were motivated by their relations with Leibniz algebras. A dialgebra that satisfies the identities (8) is called 0-dialgebra [11]. Both associative and alternative dialgebras are 0-dialgebras.

Given a 0-dialgebra $A$, the space

$$A_0 = \mathrm{Span}\{a \vdash b - a \dashv b \mid a,b \in A\}$$

is an ideal of $A$, and $\bar{A} = A/A_0$ is an ordinary algebra. The space $A$ can be considered as a bimodule over $\bar{A}$:

$$\bar{a} \cdot x = a \vdash x, \quad x \cdot \bar{a} = x \dashv a, \quad x,a \in A,$$

where $\bar{a}$ stands for the image of $a$ in $\bar{A}$.

3.2. **Varieties of dialgebras and their relation to conformal algebras.** The following definition was proposed in [20]. Suppose $\mathfrak{M}$ is a class of ordinary algebras. A 0-dialgebra $A$ is called an $\mathfrak{M}$ dialgebra if $\bar{A} \in \mathfrak{M}$ and the split null extension $\hat{A} = \bar{A} \oplus A$ belongs to $\mathfrak{M}$.

If $\mathfrak{M} = \mathrm{Var}$ is a homogeneous variety of algebras defined by poly-linear identities then this definition coincides with the operadic definition of a variety of dialgebras from [11].

**Proposition 1** ([11])**.** *Suppose $C$ is a* Var *conformal algebra. Then the same space $C$ equipped with new operations $a \vdash b = a\ {}_{(0)}\ b$, $a \dashv b = \{a\ {}_{(0)}\ b\}$, $a,b \in C$, is a* Var *dialgebra.*

This dialgebra is denoted by $C^{(0)}$. In [11], a converse statement was proved: a Var dialgebra can be embedded into $C^{(0)}$ for an appropriate Var conformal algebra $C$. Using the definition of [20], this statement can now be strengthen as follows.

**Theorem 2.** *Let $\mathfrak{M}$ be a class of ordinary algebras. Then an arbitrary $\mathfrak{M}$ dialgebra can be embedded into a current conformal algebra over an ordinary algebra from $\mathfrak{M}$.*

*Proof.* Consider an $\mathfrak{M}$ dialgebra $A$ and let $\hat{A} = \bar{A} \oplus A \in \mathfrak{M}$. Denote $H = \Bbbk[T]$, and recall that $\operatorname{Cur} \hat{A} = H \otimes \hat{A}$. Then the map

$$\psi : a \mapsto 1 \otimes \bar{a} + T \otimes a \in \operatorname{Cur} A, \quad a \in A,$$

is an injective homomorphism of dialgebras $A \to (\operatorname{Cur} \hat{A})^{(0)}$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(a) \vdash \psi(b) = (1 \otimes \bar{a} + T \otimes a) \ {}_{(0)} \ (1 \otimes \bar{b} + T \otimes b) \\ = 1 \otimes \bar{a}\bar{b} + T \otimes \bar{a} \cdot b = 1 \otimes \overline{a \vdash b} + T \otimes (a \vdash b) = \psi(a \vdash b)\end{aligned}$$

by (3), (5). The equation $\psi(a \dashv b) = \psi(a) \dashv \psi(b)$ can be proved similarly my making use of (4). □

Recall that an element $e$ of a dialgebra $A$ is called a bar-unit [17], if $e \vdash x = x \dashv e = x$ for all $x \in A$, and $(e, x, y)_\dashv = (x, e, y)_\times = (x, y, e)_\vdash = 0$ for all $x, y \in A$. The following definition was proposed in [20]: a class $\mathfrak{M}$ (di)algebras is called unital if every $\mathfrak{M}$ (di)algebra can be embedded into an $\mathfrak{M}$ (di)algebra with a (bar-)unit.

It was proved in [20] that the classes of associative and alternative dialgebras are unital. Now we can generalize this statement.

**Corollary 3.** *Let $\mathfrak{M}$ be a unital class of algebras. Then the class of $\mathfrak{M}$ dialgebras is unital.*

*Proof.* Let $A$ be an $\mathfrak{M}$ dialgebra. Then $\hat{A} \in \mathfrak{M}$, so we can find $B \in \mathfrak{M}$ such that $\hat{A}$ is a subalgebra of $B$ and $B$ contains a unit $e$.

Since $\operatorname{Cur} \hat{A} \subseteq \operatorname{Cur} B$, we have an embedding of $A$ into $(\operatorname{Cur} B)^{(0)}$. This is straightforward to check that $1 \otimes e$ is a bar-unit of $(\operatorname{Cur} B)^{(0)}$. □

3.3. **Jordan dialgebras.** Let us consider the class of Jordan dialgebras over a field $\Bbbk$ such that $\operatorname{char} \Bbbk \neq 2, 3$. In this case, the variety of Jordan algebras is defined by the following poly-linear identities:

$$x_1 x_2 = x_2 x_1, \quad J(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}J(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = x_1(x_2(x_3 x_4)) + (x_2(x_1 x_3))x_4 + x_3(x_2(x_1 x_4)) \\ - (x_1 x_2)(x_3 x_4) - (x_1 x_3)(x_2 x_4) - (x_3 x_2)(x_1 x_4).\end{aligned}$$

By the general scheme from [11], the variety of Jordan dialgebras is defined by (8) and the following identities:

$$\begin{gathered}x_1 \vdash x_2 = x_2 \dashv x_1, \\ J(\dot{x}_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = 0, \quad J(x_1, \dot{x}_2, x_3, x_4) = 0, \\ J(x_1, x_2, \dot{x}_3, x_4) = 0, \quad J(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dot{x}_4) = 0,\end{gathered} \tag{11}$$

where $J(\dots,\dot{x}_i,\dots)$ denotes the dialgebra identity obtained from $J$ by arranging operations $\vdash$, $\dashv$ in such a way that horizontal dashes are directed to the variable $x_i$, e.g.,

$$J(x_1,\dot{x}_2,x_3,x_4) = x_1 \vdash (x_2 \dashv (x_3 \dashv x_4)) + (x_2 \dashv (x_1 \dashv x_3)) \dashv x_4 + x_3 \vdash (x_2 \dashv (x_1 \dashv x_4)) - (x_1 \vdash x_2) \dashv (x_3 \dashv x_4) - (x_1 \vdash x_3) \vdash (x_2 \dashv x_4) - (x_3 \vdash x_2) \dashv (x_1 \dashv x_4). \quad (12)$$

The first identity in (11) allows to determine a Jordan dialgebra as an ordinary algebra with respect to the operation $ab = a \vdash b$ (then $a \dashv b = ba$). Rewriting (11) in terms of this operation leads to the identities

$$J(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4) = 0, \quad (13)$$

$$x_1((x_4x_3)x_2) + x_4((x_3x_1)x_2) + x_3((x_4x_1)x_2) = (x_4x_3)(x_1x_2) + (x_1x_3)(x_4x_2) + (x_4x_1)(x_3x_2). \quad (14)$$

Note that the system of identities (8), (13), (14) is equivalent to

$$[x_1x_2]x_3 = 0, \quad (x_1^2,x_2,x_3) = 2(x_1,x_2,x_1x_3), \quad x_1(x_1^2x_2) = x_1^2(x_1x_2). \quad (15)$$

**Definition 1.** An algebra $J$ over a field $\Bbbk$ ($\operatorname{char}\Bbbk \neq 2,3$) is said to be a *Leibniz—Jordan algebra* (LJ-algebra, for short) if it satisfies the identities (15).

**Remark 4.** If we implement the same scheme for Lie dialgebras, then the variety obtained would coincide with the class of Leibniz algebras [11]. Therefore, the variety of LJ-algebras relates to the variety of Jordan algebras in the same way as Leibniz algebras relate to Lie algebras.

In [21], the variety of *quasi-Jordan algebras* was introduced as a class of algebras satisfying the first and third identities from (15). By the reasons stated above, we propose Definition 1 to be a more adequate (non-commutative) dialgebra analogue of Jordan algebras.

**Example 1.** In [21], it was shown that a quasi-Jordan algebra can be constructed from a Leibniz algebra with an ad-nilpotent element as follows (we state the construction for left Leibniz algebras). If $L$ is a Leibniz algebra and $x \in L$ is an element such that $[x,[x,[x,a]]] = 0$ for all $a \in L$, then the space $L_x = L/\{a \in L \mid [x,[x,a]] = 0\}$ with respect to the operation

$$ab = [[xa]b], \quad a,b \in L,$$

is a quasi-Jordan algebra. This is straightforward to check that the second identity from (15) also holds in $L_x$, i.e., this is an LJ-algebra.

If $A$ is an arbitrary dialgebra, denote by $A^{(+)}$ the same linear space endowed with the following product:

$$ab = a \vdash b + b \dashv a, \quad a,b \in A.$$

**Example 2.** If $A$ is an alternative dialgebra then $A^{(+)}$ is an LJ-algebra.

Indeed, by Theorem 2, $A$ can be embedded into an alternative conformal algebra $C$. The anti-commutator conformal algebra $C^{(+)}$ is a Jordan conformal algebra [10]. Since the conformal 0-product in $C^{(+)}$ is defined by $a\ {}_{(0)}\ b + \{b\ {}_{(0)}\ a\} = a \vdash b + b \dashv a$ in $C^{(0)}$, $A^{(+)}$ is a subalgebra of $(C^{(+)})^{(0)}$, i.e, an LJ-algebra.

**Example 3.** Suppose $A$ is a Jordan algebra, and $M$ is a Jordan $A$-bimodule. Then the space $J = A \oplus M$ equipped by the operation

$$(a + x) \otimes (b + y) \mapsto ab + ay, \quad a, b \in A,\ x, y \in M,$$

is an LJ-algebra.

**Example 4.** Let $X$ be a finite dimensional linear space over the field $\Bbbk$, and let $\tilde{X}$ be its isomorphic copy. Consider a symmetric bilinear form $f : X \otimes X \mapsto \Bbbk$. Then the space $J = \Bbbk \oplus X \oplus \tilde{X}$ is an LJ-algebra with respect to the operation

$$(\alpha+x+\tilde{a})\otimes(\beta+y+\tilde{b}) = \alpha\beta+f(x+a, y+b)+\alpha y+\alpha\tilde{b}+\beta(\tilde{x}+\tilde{a}), \quad \alpha, \beta \in \Bbbk, \quad x, y, a, b \in X.$$

By Corollary 3, the variety of Jordan dialgebras is unital, so we may embed an arbitrary LJ-algebra $A$ into an LJ-algebra $A_1$ with a left unit $e$ which belongs to the associative center of $A_1$.

## 4. Solvability and nilpotency

Let $A$ be a non-associative algebra. Let us recall the following notations: $A^1 = A^{\langle 1\rangle} = A$, $A^n = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} A^{n-i}A^i$, $A^{\langle n\rangle} = AA^{\langle n-1\rangle}$. Algebra $A$ is said to be *nilpotent* (or *left nilpotent*) if $A^n = 0$ (or $A^{\langle n\rangle} = 0$) for some $n$.

Let us also define $A^{(1)} = A^2$, $A^{(n)} = (A^{(n-1)})^2$, $A^{[1]} = A^3$, $A^{[n]} = (A^{[n-1]})^3$. Algebra $A$ is said to be *solvable* (*cubic solvable*) if $J^{(n)} = 0$ ($J^{[n]} = 0$) for some $n$.

Assume $J$ is an LJ-algebra. Note that its solvable degrees $J^{(i)}$ are not in general ideals of $J$, but cubic solvable degrees $J^{[i]}$ are. However, $J^{(2i)} \subseteq J^{[i]} \subseteq J^{(i)}$, so solvability and cubic solvability are equivalent.

Let $\ell_a \in \operatorname{End} J$, $a \in J$, stands for the operator of left multiplication in $J$, i.e., $\ell_a : x \mapsto ax$, $x \in J$. For a subset $A \subseteq J$ denote by $\ell_J(A)$ the associative subalgebra of $\operatorname{End} J$ generated by all $\ell_a$, $a \in A$, and let $\ell(J)$ stands for $\ell_J(J)$.

Defining identities of the variety of LJ-algebras (8), (13), (14) are equivalent to the following identities in $\ell(J)$:

$$\ell_{ab} = \ell_{ba}, \tag{16}$$

$$\ell_t\ell_z\ell_y + \ell_y\ell_z\ell_t + \ell_{(yt)z} = \ell_{tz}\ell_y + \ell_{yt}\ell_z + \ell_{zy}\ell_t, \tag{17}$$

$$[\ell_y, \ell_{tz}] + [\ell_z, \ell_{yt}] + [\ell_t, \ell_{zy}] = 0. \tag{18}$$

**Proposition 5.** *An LJ-algebra $J$ is nilpotent if and only if it is left nilpotent.*

*Proof.* Let us show that if $J^{\langle n\rangle} = 0$ then $J^{2^{n+1}} = 0$. For $n = 1, 2$ the statement is clear. Suppose it is true for all $1 \le k < n$. Note that $\bar{J}$ is a Jordan algebra, so $\bar{J}^{2^n} \subseteq \bar{J}^{\langle n\rangle}$ [24].

Therefore, $J^{2^n}J \subseteq J^{\langle n\rangle}J$. Then

$$J^{2^{n+1}} = \sum_{i+j=2^{n+1}} J^iJ^j \subseteq \sum_{j=1}^{2^n}(J^{2^n}J^j + JJ^{2^n}) \subseteq J^{\langle n\rangle}J + J^{\langle n\rangle} = 0.$$

□

**Theorem 6.** *A finitely generated solvable LJ-algebra is nilpotent.*

*Proof.* Let $J$ be a solvable LJ-algebra generated by a finite set $X$. Since the statement is true for Jordan algebras [24], $J^m \subseteq [J, J]$ for some natural $m \geq 1$. It follows from Proposition 5 that $J$ is nilpotent if and only if $\ell(J)$ is nilpotent. Note that $\ell(J^m) = 0$ by (16).

The algebra $\ell(J)$ is spanned by words of the form

$$w = \ell_{b_1}\ell_{b_2}\dots\ell_{b_d} \in \ell(J), \quad b_i \in J, \tag{19}$$

and we may assume that $b_i$ are non-associative words in $X$ of length $k_i < m$.

Therefore, $\ell(J)$ is a homomorphic image of an associative algebra $F\ell(J)$ generated by the set $\{\ell_b \mid b \in J\}$ with the defining relations (16), (17), and $\ell(J^m) = 0$. These relations are the only conditions required in [24] to prove the following statement.

**Lemma 7** ([24])**.** *The algebra $F\ell(J)$ is locally nilpotent.*

The algebra $\ell(J)$ is the image of a subalgebra in $F\ell(J)$ generated by $\ell_b$, $b \in Y = X\cup X^2\cup\dots\cup X^{m-1}$, $Y$ is a finite set. Therefore, $\ell(J)$ is nilpotent, hence, $J$ is nilpotent. □

**Corollary 8.** *Let $J$ be an LJ-algebra and let $A$ be its locally nilpotent subalgebra. Then $\ell_J(A) \subseteq \ell(J)$ is locally nilpotent.*

Recall that a locally nilpotent radical of an algebra $A$ is a locally nilpotent ideal $I$ such that $A/I$ has no nonzero locally nilpotent ideals.

**Corollary 9.** *Every LJ-algebra has locally nilpotent radical.*

By means of Theorem 6, the proof is completely similar to the one for Jordan algebras (see, e.g., [24]).

An element $a$ of an LJ-algebra $J$ is nilpotent if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such as $(a^n) = 0$ for at least one bracketing. Note that LJ-algebras are not power-associative in general, however, the following statement holds.

**Corollary 10.** *If $J$ is an LJ-algebra and $a \in J$ is a nilpotent element then there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(a^N) = 0$ for all bracketings.*

*Proof.* Consider the subalgebra $A$ of $J$ generated by $a$. Then $\ell_J(A)$ is finitely generated since $\ell_J(A^n) = 0$. By Lemma 7 $\ell_J(A)$ is nilpotent, hence, $A^N = 0$ for some $N \geq 1$. □

**Corollary 11.** *If a finite-dimensional LJ-algebra is nil then it is nilpotent.*

*Proof.* Let $J$ be finite-dimensional nil LJ-algebra then $\bar{J}$ is Jordan and so it is nilpotent [1]. So $J^k \subseteq [J,J]$, i.e., $J^{(k+1)} = 0$. By Theorem 6, $J$ is nilpotent. □

**Corollary 12.** *An nil LJ-algebra $J$ of bounded index over a field of zero characteristic is solvable. If $J$ is finitely generated then it is nilpotent.*

*Proof.* Let $J$ be a nil LJ-algebra of bounded index. Then $\bar{J}$ is Jordan and so it is solvable [22], i.e., $\bar{J}^{(k)} = 0$. So for $J$ we have $J^{(k+1)} = 0$. The final statement follows from Theorem 6. □

Let us state Pierce decomposition for LJ-algebras with an idempotent. There exists a correspondence between idempotents of an LJ-algebra $J$ and its "algebraic image" $\bar{J}$.

**Lemma 13.** *Let $\bar{e}$ be an idempotent in $\bar{J}$ for an LJ-algebra $J$, $e \in J$, and let $e^2 = e + h$. Then $e + 2e(eh) + eh$ is an idempotent in $J$.*

*Proof.* Since $[J,J]J = 0$, we have

$$(e + 2e(eh) + eh)^2 = e + 2e(e(eh)) + e(eh).$$

By (13), $e(eh) - eh = 2e(eh) - 2e(e(eh)))$ or $2e(e(eh))) = e(eh) + eh$, that proves the lemma. □

Let $e$ be an idempotent in an LJ-algebra $J$. Define $U_{a,b} = \ell_a\ell_b + \ell_b\ell_a - \ell_{ab} \in \ell(J)$ and $U_a = U_{a,a}$. Consider the operators

$$U_e = 2\ell_e^2 - \ell_e, \quad U_{1-e} = 2\ell_e^2 - 3\ell_e + \mathrm{id}_J, \quad U_{1-e,e} = 2\ell_e - 2\ell_e^2,$$

so that $U_e + 2U_{1-e,e} + U_{1-e} = \mathrm{id}_J$. Let $J_1 = U_eJ$, $J_{\frac{1}{2}} = U_{1-e,e}J$, $J_0 = U_{1-e}J$.

**Theorem 14.** *Let $J$ be an LJ-algebra with an idempotent $e$. Then $J_i = \{x \in A \mid ex = ix\}$, $i = 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1$, and $J = J_1 \oplus J_{\frac{1}{2}} \oplus J_0$. Multiplication table for Pierce components is the following:*

$$J_1^2 \subseteq J_1, \quad J_0J_1, J_1J_0 = 0, \quad J_0^2,$$
$$J_0J_{\frac{1}{2}} = J_{\frac{1}{2}}J_0 \subseteq J_{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad J_1J_{\frac{1}{2}} = J_{\frac{1}{2}}J_1 \subseteq J_{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad J_{\frac{1}{2}}^2 \subseteq J_10 + J_1.$$

*Proof.* From (14) we have

$$e^2(xy) = e(xy) = -2(ex)(ey) + x(ey) + 2e((ex)y),$$

where $x \in J_i, y \in J_k$. It gives that

$$(2i-1)e(xy) = k(2i-1)xy.$$

From (13) we obtain that $(2k-1)e(xy) = i(2k-1)xy$. As a corollary we can state that $J_1J_k$ (and $J_kJ_1$) $\subseteq J_k$, $J_0J_k$ (and $J_kJ_0$) $\subseteq J_k$. Also $J_0J_1 (= J_1J_0) \subseteq J_0 \cap J_1 = (0)$. To prove the last identity we need to show that $L_e(L_e - E)J_{\frac{1}{2}}^2 = (0)$, i.e. $e(e(xy)) = e(xy)$ for all $x, y \in J$. It is sufficient to proceed only with $J\frac{1}{2}$. From (13)

$$((xe)e)y + x(e(ey)) + e(e(xy)) = 2(ex)(ey) + e(xy),$$

i.e.,

$$e(e(xy)) - e(xy) = 2ik(xy) - (i^2 + k^2)xy = -(i-k)^2xy = 0,$$

as $x, y \in J_{\frac{1}{2}}$. □

## 5. Structure Leibniz algebra

5.1. **Di-endomorphisms.** Let us fix an embedding of an LJ-algebra $J$ into a Jordan conformal algebra $C$. By $H$ we denote the polynomial algebra $\Bbbk[T]$ which has the canonical Hopf algebra structure.

The space $\operatorname{Cend} C$ is an associative dialgebra with respect to the following operations:

$$(\varphi \vdash \psi)_n = \varphi_0\psi_n, \quad (\varphi \dashv \psi)_n = \varphi_n\psi_0, \tag{20}$$

where $\varphi, \psi \in \operatorname{Cend} C$, $n \geq 0$. Indeed, this is straightforward to check that $\varphi \vdash \psi$ and $\varphi \dashv \psi$ are conformal linear maps (i.e., relations (6) hold), and the operations (20) satisfy (8), (9).

Let us also denote by $\vdash$ and $\dashv$ the following two $\Bbbk$-linear maps:

$$\vdash, \dashv\colon \operatorname{Cend} C \otimes C \to C,$$
$$\varphi \vdash a = \varphi_0(a), \quad \varphi \dashv a = \sum_{n\geq 0} T^n\varphi_n(a),$$
$$\varphi \in \operatorname{Cend} C, \quad a \in C.$$

**Lemma 15.** *For all $\varphi, \psi \in \operatorname{Cend} C$, $a \in C$ we have*

$$(\varphi \vdash \psi) \vdash a = (\varphi \dashv \psi) \vdash a = \varphi \vdash (\psi \vdash a),$$
$$(\varphi \vdash \psi) \dashv a = \varphi \vdash (\psi \dashv a),$$
$$(\varphi \dashv \psi) \dashv a = \varphi \dashv (\psi \dashv a) = \varphi \dashv (\psi \vdash a).$$

*Proof.* It follows from the definitions, that

$$(\varphi \vdash \psi) \vdash a = (\varphi \dashv \psi) \vdash a = \varphi \vdash (\psi \vdash a) = \varphi_0\psi_0(a),$$

$$(\varphi \vdash \psi) \dashv a = \varphi \vdash (\psi \dashv a) = \sum_{n\geq 0} T^n(\varphi_0\psi_n(a)).$$

Let us check the last relation:

$$(\varphi \dashv \psi) \dashv a = \sum_{n\geq 0} T^n((\varphi \dashv \psi)_n(a)) = \sum_{n\geq 0} T^n(\varphi_n\psi_0(a)) = \varphi \dashv (\psi \vdash a).$$

On the other hand,

$$\varphi \dashv (\psi \dashv a) = \sum_{n\geq 0} T^n\varphi_n(\psi \dashv a) = \sum_{n\geq 0} T^n\varphi_n\left(\sum_{m\geq 0} T^m\psi_m(a)\right).$$

It follows from (7) that

$$\varphi \dashv (\psi \dashv a) = \sum_{n,m,s\geq 0} (-1)^s \binom{m}{s} T^{n+m-s} \varphi_{n-s}\psi_m(a).$$

Assuming $t = n - s \geq 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi \dashv (\psi \dashv a) &= \sum_{t,m,s\geq 0} (-1)^s T^{t+m} \binom{m}{s} \varphi_t\psi_m(a) \\ &= \sum_{t,m\geq 0} \left( \sum_{s\geq 0} (-1)^s \binom{m}{s} \right) T^{t+m}\varphi_t\psi_m(a) = \sum_{t\geq 0} T^t \varphi_t\psi_0(a).\end{aligned}$$

This proves the last equality. □

**Remark 16.** In the case when $C$ is finitely generated over $H$ (e.g., if $\dim J < \infty$) then the last lemma can also be derived from the associativity of the pseudo-algebra $\operatorname{Cend} C$. If $C$ is not a finite $H$-module then $\operatorname{Cend} C$ is not a pseudo-algebra, so we have to prove the statement explicitly.

**Lemma 17.** *Suppose $C$ is a pseudo-algebra, $\varphi \in \operatorname{Cend} C$, $x, y \in C$. Then the following relations hold in the dialgebra $C^{(0)}$:*

$$(\varphi \dashv x) \vdash y = (\varphi \vdash x) \vdash y, \quad x \dashv (\varphi \vdash y) = x \dashv (\varphi \dashv y).$$

*Proof.* Let us check the second relation. By definition,

$$\varphi \dashv y = \sum_{n\geq 0} T^n \varphi_n(y),$$

but since $x \dashv Tz = 0$, we have $x \dashv (\varphi \dashv y) = x \dashv \varphi_0(y) = x \dashv (\varphi \vdash y)$. □

Consider operators $L_a \in \operatorname{Cend} C$ of left pseudo-multiplication on $a \in J \subseteq C$. Namely,

$$L_a : x \mapsto a * x \in (H \otimes H) \otimes_H C, \quad x \in C.$$

In particular, if $x \in J$ then $(L_a)_0 : x \mapsto L_a \vdash x = ax \in J$. Since $C$ is a commutative pseudo-algebra,

$$L_a(x) = a * x = (\sigma_{12} \otimes_H \mathrm{id}_C)(x * a),$$

so

$$L_a \dashv x = L_x \vdash a = xa \in J, \quad x \in J.$$

**Definition 2.** Given an embedding of $J$ into a pseudo-algebra $C$, define the space of *di-endomorphisms* of $J$ as

$$\operatorname{Diend}_C J = \{\varphi \in \operatorname{Cend} C \mid \varphi \vdash J, \varphi \dashv J \subseteq J\} / \{\varphi \in \operatorname{Cend} C \mid \varphi \vdash J = \varphi \dashv J = 0\}.$$

We will denote $\mathrm{Diend}_C J$ by $\mathrm{Diend}\, J$ when the embedding of $J$ into $C$ is fixed.

For example, the images of operators of left pseudo-multiplication $L_a \in \mathrm{Cend}\, C$, $a \in J$, are di-endomorphisms of $J$; we will also denote them by $L_a$. Let $L(J)$ is the linear subspace in $\mathrm{Diend}\, J$ spanned by all operators $L_a$, $a \in J$. If $A$ is a subspace of $J$, then $L_J(A) = L(A)$ stands for the subspace $\{L_a \mid a \in A\} \subseteq L(J)$.

It is clear that the operations $\vdash, \dashv$ are correctly defined on $\mathrm{Diend}\, J \otimes \mathrm{Diend}\, J \to \mathrm{Diend}\, J$ and on $\mathrm{Diend}\, J \otimes J \to J$. Then all the properties proved in Lemmas 15, 17 above holds for $\mathrm{Diend}\, J$ instead of $\mathrm{Cend}\, C$. In particular, $\mathrm{Diend}\, J$ is an associative dialgebra, and $(\mathrm{Diend}\, J)^{(-)}$ is a Leibniz algebra.

**Lemma 18.** *The following relation holds in* $(\mathrm{Diend}\, J)^{(-)}$*:*

$$[L_{ab}, L_c] = [L_b, L_{ac}] + [L_a, L_{bc}], \quad a, b, c \in J.$$

*Proof.* Let $D = [L_{ab}, L_c] - [L_b, L_{ac}] - [L_a, L_{bc}] \in \mathrm{Diend}\, J$. It is sufficient to check that $D \vdash d = D \dashv d = 0$ for all $d \in J$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} D \vdash d = {} & L_{ab} \vdash L_c \vdash d - L_c \vdash L_{ab} \vdash d - L_b \vdash L_{ac} \vdash d + L_{ac} \vdash L_b \vdash d - L_a \vdash L_{bc} \vdash d \\ & + L_{bc} \vdash L_a \vdash d = (ab)(cd) - c((ab)d) - b((ac)d) + (ac)(bd) - a((bc)d) + (bc)(ad), \end{aligned}$$

which is zero due to (14), and

$$\begin{aligned} D \dashv d = {} & L_{ab} \vdash L_c \dashv d - L_c \dashv L_{ab} \dashv d - L_b \vdash L_{ac} \dashv d + L_{ac} \dashv L_b \dashv d - L_a \vdash L_{bc} \dashv d \\ & + L_{bc} \dashv L_a \dashv d = (ab)(dc) - (d(ab))c - b(d(ac)) + (db)(ac) - a(d(bc)) + (ad)(bc), \end{aligned}$$

which is zero due to (13). □

5.2. **Quasi-derivations.**

**Definition 3.** A di-endomorphism $D \in \mathrm{Diend}\, J$ is called a *quasi-derivation* of $J$ if

$$D \vdash (xy) = (D \vdash x)y + x(D \vdash y), \quad D \dashv (xy) = y(D \dashv x) + x(D \dashv y) \tag{21}$$

for all $x, y \in J$.

Denote by $\mathrm{QDer}(J) = \mathrm{QDer}_C(J) \subseteq \mathrm{Diend}\, J$ the space of all quasi-derivations of $J$ with respect to the embedding $J \subseteq C^{(0)}$.

**Proposition 19.** *Let* $a, b \in J$, $D = [L_a, L_b] := L_a \vdash L_b - L_b \dashv L_a \in \mathrm{Diend}\, J$. *Then* $D$ *is a quasi-derivation of* $J$.

*Proof.* Note that $[L_a, L_b] \vdash x = a(bx) - b(ax)$, $[L_a, L_b] \dashv x = a(xb) - (xa)b = -(a, x, b)$. We have to deduce that the following identities hold in LJ-algebras:

$$(b(ax))y + a(b(xy)) + x(b(ay)) = (a(bx))y + b(a(xy)) + x(a(by)),$$

$$(a, xy, b) = x(a, y, b) + y(a, x, b).$$

The first one means that the commutator of two operators of left multiplication in LJ-algebras is a usual derivation. This is easy to deduce from (13).

The second identity can be obtained as follows. Partial linearization of the second identity of (15) leads to

$$2(xa)(xb) + x^2(ab) = 2x((xa)b) + a(x^2b).$$

Subtract $(x^2a)b = (ax^2)b$ from left and right parts to get

$$2(xa)(xb) - (x^2, a, b) = 2x((xa)b) - (a, x^2, b).$$

Now use (15) to obtain

$$(a, x^2, b) = 2x(a, x, b).$$

Linearization of this identity leads to the required relation by means of the first identity of (15). □

**Remark 20.** In the case when $C$ is a finite $H$-module, the last proposition can also be derived from the fact that $D = [L_a * L_b]$ is a pseudo-derivation of the Jordan pseudo-algebra $C$ [12], i.e., $D$ satisfies the condition

$$D(a * b) = D(a) * b + (\sigma_{12} \otimes_H \mathrm{id}_C)(a * D(b)) \in H^{\otimes 3} \otimes_H C.$$

**Lemma 21.** *The space* $\mathrm{QDer}(J)$ *is a Leibniz subalgebra of* $(\mathrm{Diend}\, J)^{(-)}$.

*Proof.* It is sufficient to check that if $D_1, D_2 \in \mathrm{QDer}(J)$ then $D = [D_1, D_2] = D_1 \vdash D_2 - D_2 \dashv D_1$ also belongs to $\mathrm{QDer}(J)$.

It follows from Lemma 15 that $(D_1 \vdash D_2 - D_2 \dashv D_1) \vdash (xy) = (D_1 \vdash D_2 - D_2 \vdash D_1) \vdash (xy)$, and it is well known that commutator of two derivations of ordinary algebra is again a derivation. Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D \dashv (xy) &= D_1 \vdash (D_2 \dashv (xy)) - D_2 \dashv (D_1 \dashv (xy)) \\ &= D_1 \vdash x(D_2 \dashv y) + D_1 \vdash y(D_2 \dashv x) - D_2 \dashv x(D_1 \dashv y) - D_2 \dashv y(D_1 \dashv x) \\ &= x(D_1 \vdash (D_2 \dashv y)) + (D_1 \vdash x)(D_2 \dashv y) + y(D_1 \vdash (D_2 \dashv x)) + (D_1 \vdash y)(D_2 \dashv x) \\ &- x(D_2 \dashv (D_1 \dashv y)) - (D_1 \dashv y)(D_2 \dashv x) - y(D_2 \dashv (D_1 \dashv x)) - (D_1 \dashv x)(D_2 \dashv y) \\ &= x(D \dashv y) + y(D \dashv x) \end{aligned}$$

since $(D_i \dashv a)b = (D_i \vdash a)b$ by Lemma 15. □

5.3. **Structure algebra.** Let

$$\mathrm{S}(J) = L(J) \oplus \mathrm{QDer}(J)$$

be the formal direct sum of two subspaces of $\mathrm{Diend}\, J$. Define the following operation $[\cdot, \cdot]_s$ on $\mathrm{S}(J)$:

$$\begin{gathered} [L_a, L_b]_s = [L_a, L_b] \in \mathrm{QDer}(J), \quad [D, L_a]_s = L_{D \vdash a} \in L(J), \\ [L_a, D]_s = -L_{D \dashv a} \in L(J), \quad [D_1, D_2]_s = [D_1, D_2] \in \mathrm{QDer}(J) \end{gathered} \tag{22}$$

for $a, b \in J$, $D_1, D_2 \in \mathrm{QDer}(J)$.

**Theorem 22.** *The space* $\mathrm{S}(J)$ *is a Leibniz algebra with respect to the operation* (22).

*Proof.* It is enough to make sure that the Leibniz identity $[x,[y,z]_s]_s = [y,[x,z]_s]_s + [[x,y]_s,z]_s$ holds for all $x,y,z \in \mathrm{S}(J)$. This can be done in a straightforward way by making use of the following equalities:

$$\begin{gathered}[L_a,L_c] \dashv b - [L_b,L_c] \dashv a = [L_a,L_b] \vdash c,\\ L_{D\vdash a} = [D,L_a], \quad L_{D\dashv a} = -[L_a,D],\end{gathered} \tag{23}$$

where $a,b,c \in J$, $D \in \mathrm{QDer}(J)$, and the commutators are computed in $(\mathrm{Diend}\, J)^{(-)}$.

Indeed, $[L_a,L_c] \dashv b - [L_b,L_c] \dashv a = -(ab)c + a(bc) + (ba)c - b(ac) = a(bc) - b(ac) = [L_a,L_b] \vdash c$ because of the first identity in (15).

Further, $[D,L_a] \vdash x = D \vdash (ax) - (L_a \dashv D) \vdash x = (D \vdash a)x + a(D \vdash x) - L_a \vdash (D \vdash x) = (D \vdash a)x = L_{D\vdash a}x$ for all $x \in J$. The last equality can be proved in a similar way. □

Let $\mathrm{S}_0(J)$ stands for the subspace of $\mathrm{S}(J)$ spanned by $L_{ab} \in L(J^2)$ and $[L_a,L_b] \in \mathrm{QDer}(J)$ for all $a,b \in J$. Note that this subspace is closed under the Leibniz bracket $[\cdot,\cdot]_s$. Therefore, $\mathrm{S}_0(J)$ is a Leibniz subalgebra of $\mathrm{S}(J)$, which is called the *structure algebra* of $J$.

Note that the construction of $\mathrm{S}_0(J)$ is based on the embedding $J \subseteq C^{(0)}$ which has been fixed in the very beginning. Let us show that the structure algebra $\mathrm{S}_0(J)$ does not actually depend on the choice of $C$.

**Lemma 23.** *Let $C_1$ and $C_2$ be Jordan conformal algebras such that $J \subseteq C_i^{(0)}$, $i = 1,2$. Assume there exists an epimorphism of conformal algebras $\tau : C_1 \to C_2$ such that $\tau$ acts on $J$ as the identity map. Denote by $\mathrm{S}_0^i(J)$ the structure Leibniz algebra based on the embedding of $J$ into $C_i^{(0)}$, $i = 1,2$. Then $\mathrm{S}_0^1(J) \simeq \mathrm{S}_0^2(J)$.*

*Proof.* Recall that $\mathrm{S}_0^i(J)$ is a Leibniz subalgebra of $\mathrm{S}^i(J) = L^i(J) \oplus \mathrm{QDer}^i(J)$, where $L^i(J)$ is spanned by the di-endomorphisms $L_a^i \in \mathrm{Diend}_{C_i} J$, $a \in J$, $\mathrm{QDer}^i(J) = \mathrm{QDer}_{C_i}(J)$.

The desired isomorphism is supposed to be defined as $L_{ab}^1 \mapsto L_{ab}^2$, $[L_a^1,L_b^1] \mapsto [L_a^2,L_b^2]$, $a,b \in J$. To prove that this map is in fact a well-defined isomorphism of Leibniz algebras, it is enough to show that the associative dialgebras $A_i$, $i = 1,2$, generated in $\mathrm{Diend}_{C_i} J$ by the operators $L_a^i$, $a \in J$, are isomorphic.

Denote by $B_i$ the associative dialgebra generated by all $L_a^i \in \mathrm{Cend}\, C_i$, $a \in J$, $i = 1,2$. Then $A_i = B_i/\{b \in B_i \mid b \vdash J = b \dashv J = 0\}$. Let $\pi_i$ stands for the natural map $B_i \to A_i$.

Let $F = Fd\langle J\rangle$ be the free associative dialgebra generated by $J$ as by a set of generators, $\tau_i : F \to B_i \subseteq (\mathrm{Cend}\, C_i)^{(0)}$ be the epimorphisms of dialgebras given by $a \mapsto L_a^i \in \mathrm{Cend}\, C_i$, $a \in J$.

It was shown in [17] that every element of $F$ can be uniquely presented as a linear combination of monomials of the form $\dot{u}_j = x_1 \ldots \dot{x}_j \ldots x_n$, $n \geq 1$, $1 \leq j \leq n$, $u = x_1 \ldots x_n$ is a word in $J$, where the dot over $x_j$ means that the dialgebra operations in $\dot{u}_j$ are arranged in such a way that horizontal dashes are directed at $x_j$. Note that if $u = x_1 \ldots x_n$ then

$$\tau_i(\dot{u}_j) = L_{x_1}^i \vdash \ldots \vdash L_{x_j}^i \dashv \ldots \dashv L_{x_n}^i.$$

Therefore,

$$\tau(\tau_1(f)\ {}_{(m)}\ x) = \tau_2(f)\ {}_{(m)}\ \tau(x)$$

for all $f \in F$, $m \geq 0$, $x \in C_1$. Since $\tau$ is surjective, $\operatorname{Ker}\tau_1 \subseteq \operatorname{Ker}\tau_2$, and there exists an epimorphism $\psi : B_1 \to B_2$ such that $\psi(L^1_a) = L^2_a$, $a \in J$. In particular,

$$\psi(b)\ {}_{(m)}\ \tau(x) = \tau(b\ {}_{(m)}\ x), \quad b \in B_1,\ m \geq 0,\ x \in C_1.$$

Consider the composition $\psi \circ \pi_2 : B_1 \to A_2$. Note that $b \vdash J, b \dashv J \subseteq J$ for every $b \in B_1$. Therefore,

$$\psi(b) \vdash x = b \vdash x \in J, \quad \psi(b) \dashv x = b \dashv x \in J$$

for every $x \in J$, and $\operatorname{Ker}(\pi_2 \circ \psi) = \operatorname{Ker}\pi_1$. Hence, $A_1 \simeq A_2$. □

**Proposition 24.** *The structure algebra* $\mathrm{S}_0(J)$ *does not depend on the choice of embedding* $J \subseteq C^{(0)}$.

*Proof.* Suppose $C_1$ and $C_2$ are two Jordan conformal algebras such that $J \subseteq C_i^{(0)}$, $i = 1, 2$. Consider the Cartesian product $C = C_1 \times C_2$, which is also a Jordan conformal algebra, and $J \subseteq C^{(0)}$ in the obvious way: $a \mapsto (a, a) \in C$.

The canonical projections $\pi_i : C \to C_i$ are epimorphisms of conformal algebras such that $\pi_i|_J = \mathrm{id}$. By Lemma 23, $\mathrm{S}^i_0(J) \simeq \mathrm{S}_0(J)$, where $\mathrm{S}_0(J)$ stands for the structure Leibniz algebra based on the embedding $J \subseteq C^{(0)}$. Therefore, $\mathrm{S}^1_0(J) \simeq \mathrm{S}^2_0(J)$. □

## 6. The Tits—Kantor—Koecher construction

6.1. **Super-structure Leibniz algebra.** Suppose $J$ is an LJ-algebra as above, and let $\mathrm{S}_0(J)$ be its structure Leibniz algebra built in the previous section.

By the definition, $\mathrm{S}_0(J) \subseteq \operatorname{Diend}_C J \oplus \operatorname{Diend}_C J$ for some Jordan conformal algebra $C$ such that $J \subseteq C^{(0)}$. Neither the structure of $\mathrm{S}_0(J)$, nor the operations

$$\vdash, \dashv\colon \mathrm{S}_0(J) \otimes J \to J,$$
$$(L_x + [L_y, L_z]) \vdash a = xa + [L_y, L_z] \vdash a = xa + y(za) - z(ya),$$
$$(L_x + [L_y, L_z]) \dashv a = ax + [L_y, L_z] \dashv a = ax + y(az) - (ay)z,$$

depend on the choice of $C$. It follows from relations (23) that

$$\begin{aligned} [U, V]_s \vdash a &= U \vdash (V \vdash a) - V \vdash (U \vdash a), \\ [U, V]_s \dashv a &= U \vdash (V \dashv a) - V \dashv (U \dashv a) \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

for all $U, V \in \mathrm{S}_0(J)$, $a \in J$

Consider the formal direct sum

$$\mathrm{T}(J) = J^+ \oplus \mathrm{S}_0(J) \oplus J^-,$$

where $J^\pm$ are isomorphic copies of the space $J$. The image of an element $a \in J$ in $J^\pm$ we will denote by $a^\pm$.

Define a bilinear operation $[\cdot,\cdot]_t$ on $\mathrm{T}(J)$ as follows:

$$\begin{gathered}[a^+,b^+]_t=[a^-,b^-]_t=0,\quad [D,U]_t=[D,U]_s,\\ [a^+,b^-]_t=-L_{ab}+[L_a,L_b],\quad [a^-,b^+]_t=L_{ab}+[L_a,L_b],\\ [a^-,D]_t=-(D\dashv a)^-,\quad [a^+,D]_t=-(D^*\dashv a)^+,\\ [D,a^-]_t=(D\vdash a)^-,\quad [D,a^+]_t=(D^*\vdash a)^+,\end{gathered}\tag{25}$$

where $a,b\in J$, $D,U\in \mathrm{S}_0(J)$, and if $D=L_x+[L_y,L_z]$ then $D^*$ stands for $-L_x+[L_y,L_z]$.

It is useful to note that the map

$$a^+ + D + b^- \mapsto b^+ + D^* + a^-,\quad a,b\in J,\ D\in \mathrm{S}_0(J),$$

is an automorphism of $\mathrm{T}(J)$.

**Theorem 25.** *The space* $\mathrm{T}(J)$ *equipped with the operation* (25) *is a* $\mathbb{Z}_3$*-graded Leibniz algebra.*

*Proof.* It is easy to see from (25) that $\mathrm{T}(J)$ is indeed a $\mathbb{Z}_3$-graded algebra with homogeneous components $J^+$, $\mathrm{S}_0(J)$, $J^-$.

This is straightforward to compute that the Leibniz identity (1) holds for the operation $[\cdot,\cdot]_t$. Let us consider some examples in order to derive necessary relations.

(1) For $x=a^+$, $y=b^+$, $z=c^-$, $a,b,c\in J$, we have

$$[x,[y,z]_t]_t=[a^+,-L_{bc}+[L_b,L_c]]_t=(-L_{bc}\dashv a-[L_b,L_c]\dashv a)^+=(-a(bc)-b(ac)+(ab)c)^+,$$

so

$$[y,[x,z]_t]_t=(-b(ac)-a(bc)+(ba)c)^+,\quad [[x,y]_t,z]_t=0,$$

so (1) holds.

(2) For $x=a^+$, $y=b^-$, $a,b\in J$, and $z=U\in \mathrm{S}_0(J)$, we have

$$\begin{gathered}[x,[y,z]_t]_t=-[a^+,(U\dashv b)^-]_t=L_{a(U\dashv b)}-[L_a,L_{U\dashv b}],\\ [y,[x,z]_t]_t=-L_{b(U^*\dashv a)}-[L_b,L_{U^*\dashv a}],\\ [[x,y]_t,z]_t=-[L_{ab},U]_s+[[L_a,L_b],U]_s.\end{gathered}$$

Consider two cases: $U\in L(J)$, and $U\in \mathrm{QDer}(J)$. In the first case, $U=L_c$, $c\in J$, $U^*=-U$, so

$$\begin{gathered}[x,[y,z]_t]_t=L_{a(bc)}-[L_a,L_{bc}],\quad [y,[x,z]_t]_t=L_{b(ac)}+[L_b,L_{ac}],\\ [[x,y]_t,z]_t=L_{[L_a,L_b]\vdash c}-[L_{ab},L_c].\end{gathered}$$

Therefore, the required relation follows from the obvious equality $[L_a,L_b]\vdash c=a(bc)-b(ac)$ and Lemma 18.

In the second case, $U^*=U$, so

$$[[x,y]_t,z]_t=L_{U\dashv(ab)}+[[L_a,L_b],U].$$

Then (1) follows from Definition 3 and Lemma 21.

(3) For $x = U$, $z = V$, $U, V \in \mathrm{S}_0(J)$, $y = a^+$, $a \in J$, we have

$$[x,[y,z]_t]_t = -[U,(V^* \dashv a)^+]_t = -(U^* \vdash (V^* \dashv a))^+,$$

$$[y,[x,z]_t]_t = [a^+,[U,V]_s]_t = -([U,V]_s^* \dashv a)^+,$$

$$[[x,y]_t,z]_t = [(U^* \vdash a)^+,V]_t = -(V^* \dashv (U^* \vdash a))^+.$$

Then (24) implies the required relation by means that $U \mapsto U^*$ is an automorphism of $\mathrm{S}_0(J)$.

For other choice of $x$, $y$, $z$ from homogeneous components of $\mathrm{T}(J)$, the Leibniz identity can be verified in a similar way. □

The Leibniz algebra $\mathcal{L} = \mathrm{T}(J)$ is called *super-structure* algebra of $J$. This is a non-commutative analogue of the Tits—Kantor—Koecher construction. Since both $J$ and $\mathcal{L}$ are 0-dialgebras, it is reasonable to explore relations between the Jordan algebra $\bar{J}$ and the Lie algebra $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$.

**Theorem 26.** *If an LJ-algebra $J$ contains a bar-unit then $\overline{\mathrm{T}(J)} \simeq \mathrm{T}(\bar{J})$.*

*Proof.* Suppose $J_1$ and $J_2$ are two LJ-algebras, $\varphi$ is a homomorphism from $J_1$ onto $J_2$. Then there exists a homogeneous epimorphism of Leibniz algebras $\tau = \mathrm{T}(\varphi) : \mathrm{T}(J_1) \to \mathrm{T}(J_2)$ given by

$$\tau(a^\pm) = \varphi(a)^\pm, \quad \tau(L_a) = L_{\varphi(a)}, \quad \tau([L_a,L_b]) = [L_{\varphi(a)},L_{\varphi(b)}], \quad a,b \in J_1.$$

In particular, for an LJ-algebra $J$, the natural epimorphism $J \to \bar{J}$ gives rise to an epimorphism $\tau : \mathrm{T}(J) \to \mathrm{T}(\bar{J})$. Since $\bar{J}$ is an ordinary Jordan algebra, $\mathrm{T}(\bar{J})$ is a Lie algebra (the ordinary TKK construction). Thus,

$$\operatorname{Ker}\tau \supseteq I_0 := \operatorname{Span}\{[x,y]_t + [y,x]_t \mid x,y \in \mathrm{T}(J)\},$$

where $\overline{\mathrm{T}(J)} = \mathrm{T}(J)/I_0$.

Since $\tau$ is a homogeneous homomorphism, $\operatorname{Ker}\tau = (\operatorname{Ker}\tau \cap J^+) \oplus (\operatorname{Ker}\tau \cap \mathrm{S}_0(J) \oplus (\operatorname{Ker}\tau \cap J^-)$. Note that if $e \in J$ is a bar-unit then $L(J) \subseteq \mathrm{S}_0(J)$ since $L_a = \frac{1}{2}([e^-,a^+]_t - [e^+,a^-]_t)$, $a \in J$.

If $a^+ \in \operatorname{Ker}\tau \cap J^+$, $a \in J$, then $a = \sum_i [x_i,y_i] \in [J,J]$. Since $[L_{x_i},y_i^+]_t = -(x_iy_i)^+$, $[y_i^+,L_{x_i}]_t = (y_ix_i)^+$ by (25), $a^+ \in I_0$. In the same way one may show that $\operatorname{Ker}\tau \cap J^- \subseteq I_0$.

If $U \in \operatorname{Ker}\tau \cap S_0(J)$, $U = L_a + [L_b,L_c]$, then $\tau(L_a) = \tau([L_b,L_c]) = 0$ by the construction of $\mathrm{S}(J)$. Since $\tau(L_a) = L_{\bar{a}} \in \mathrm{S}_0(\bar{J})$, we have $aJ, Ja \subseteq [J,J]$, in particular, $a = ea \in [J,J]$. It is easy to see that $L([J,J]) \subseteq I_0$.

If $\tau([L_b,L_c]) = 0$ then $\tau([L_b,L_{ce}]) = 0$ since $[L_b,L_c] - [L_b,L_{ce}] \in [L(J),L([J,J])] \subseteq I_0$. But since $e$ belongs to the associative center of $J$, we have $[L_b,L_{ce}] = [L_{be},L_{ce}] = -[L_{ce},L_{be}]$. Therefore, $[L_b,L_c] \in \frac{1}{2}([L_{be},L_{ce}] + [L_{ce},L_{be}]) + [L(J),L([J,J])] \in I_0$.

We have proved that $\operatorname{Ker}\tau = I_0$ which implies the claim. □

**Remark 27.** In general, this is not true that $\overline{\mathrm{T}(J)} \simeq \mathrm{T}(\bar{J})$. As an example, one may consider $J = A^{(+)}$, where $A$ is the associative dialgebra of the form

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Bbbk[x] & \Bbbk[x] \\ 0 & 0 & \Bbbk \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $[J, J] = x\Bbbk[x]e_{13} \neq 0$, where $e_{13}$ is the matrix unit. But $J^3 = 0$, so $\operatorname{Ker}\tau \not\subseteq I_0$.

Since the structure Leibniz algebra $\mathrm{S}_0(J)$ does not depend on the embedding of $J$ into a Jordan conformal algebra, consider the simplest case $J \hookrightarrow (\operatorname{Cur}\hat{J})^{(0)}$ from Theorem 2. Recall that $\hat{J} = \bar{J} \oplus J$ is the split null extension of the Jordan algebra $\bar{J}$, and the embedding is given by $a \mapsto \hat{a} = 1 \otimes \bar{a} + T \otimes a$, $a \in J$.

**Theorem 28.** *The super-structure Leibniz algebra* $\mathrm{T}(J)$ *is isomorphic to a subalgebra of* $(\operatorname{Cur}\mathrm{T}(\hat{J}))^{(0)}$.

*Proof.* Consider the map $\psi : \mathrm{T}(J) \to (\operatorname{Cur}\mathrm{T}(\hat{J}))^{(0)}$ defined by

$$a^{\pm} \mapsto \hat{a}^{\pm} = 1 \otimes \bar{a}^{\pm} + T \otimes a^{\pm}, \quad a \in J, \tag{26}$$

$$L_a \mapsto 1 \otimes \ell_{\bar{a}} + T \otimes \ell_a, \quad a \in J, \tag{27}$$

$$\sum_i [L_{a_i}, L_{b_i}] \mapsto \sum_i (1 \otimes [\ell_{\bar{a}_i}, \ell_{\bar{b}_i}] + T \otimes [\ell_{\bar{a}_i}, \ell_{b_i}]), \quad a_i, b_i \in J. \tag{28}$$

Here $\ell_x$ stands for the operator of left multiplication by $x$ in $\hat{J}$.

This is easy to see that (26) is a well-defined injective map. Moreover, this is straightforward to check that this is a homomorphism of Leibniz algebras. □

The following definition generalizes the similar notion for Jordan algebras [7]. For an LJ-algebra $J$, consider the sequence

$$J^{(1)} = J, \quad J^{(2)} = J^2, \quad J^{(n+1)} = J^{(n)}J^{(n)} + J(J^{(n)}J^{(n)}) + (J^{(n)}J^{(n)})J, \ n > 1.$$

It follows from (13), (14) that all $J^{(n)}$ are ideals of $J$. If there exists $N \geq 1$ such that $J^{(N)} = 0$ then $J$ is said to be *strongly solvable* (or *Penico solvable*). Note that an LJ-algebra $J$ is strongly solvable if and only if so is the Jordan algebra $\bar{J}$. Also, $J$ is strongly solvable (or nilpotent) if and only if $\hat{J}$ is strongly solvable (or nilpotent).

**Theorem 29.** *An LJ-algebra* $J$ *is strongly solvable if and only if* $\mathrm{T}(J)$ *is solvable.*

*Proof.* If $J$ is strongly solvable then $\hat{J}$ is strongly solvable, and thus $\mathrm{T}(\hat{J})$, the ordinary TKK construction, is a solvable Lie algebra. Therefore, $\operatorname{Cur}\mathrm{T}(\hat{J})$ is a solvable Lie conformal algebra. Hence, $(\operatorname{Cur}\mathrm{T}(\hat{J}))^{(0)}$ is a solvable Leibniz algebra that contains $\mathrm{T}(J)$ as a subalgebra.

Conversely, if $\mathrm{T}(J)$ is solvable then so is the Lie algebra $\overline{\mathrm{T}(J)}$. It was shown in the proof of Theorem 26 that $\mathrm{T}(\bar{J})$ is always a homomorphic image of $\overline{\mathrm{T}(J)}$, hence, it is solvable.

Since $\mathrm{T}(\bar{J})$ is the ordinary TKK construction for a Jordan algebra, $\bar{J}$ is strongly solvable [7], therefore, $J$ is strongly solvable. □

**Theorem 30.** *An LJ-algebra $J$ is nilpotent if and only if $\mathrm{T}(J)$ is nilpotent.*

*Proof.* Let $\mathcal{L}$ stands for the TKK construction of an LJ-algebra $J$.

If $J$ is nilpotent then $\mathrm{T}(J)$ is nilpotent by the very same reasons as stated in the proof of Theorem 29.

Conversely, if $a \in J^n$, $n \geq 2$, then

$$L_a \in \mathcal{L}^0_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}, \quad a^{\pm} \in \mathcal{L}^{\pm}_{\lceil n/2 \rceil},$$

where $\lceil n/2 \rceil$ stands for the upper integral part of $n/2$. Indeed, for $n = 2$ the statement is trivial. If it is true for all $m < n$, then for $a \in J^n$, $a = bc$, $b \in J^s$, $c \in J^{n-s}$, $s = 1, \ldots, n-1$, we have

$$L_a = \frac{1}{2}([b^-, c^+]_t - [b^+, c^-]_t) \in [\mathcal{L}^{\lceil s/2 \rceil}, \mathcal{L}^{\lceil (n-s)/2 \rceil}]_t + [\mathcal{L}^{\lceil (n-s)/2 \rceil}, \mathcal{L}^{\lceil s/2 \rceil}]_t \subseteq \mathcal{L}^{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$$

since $\lceil s/2 \rceil + \lceil (n-s)/2 \rceil \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$. Similarly, $a^{\pm} = \mp[L_b, c^{\pm}]_t \in [\mathcal{L}^{\lceil s/2 \rceil}, \mathcal{L}^{\lceil (n-s)/2 \rceil}]_t \subseteq \mathcal{L}^{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$.

Hence, if $\mathcal{L} = \mathrm{T}(J)$ is nilpotent then so is $J$. □

**Acknowledgements.** This work was partially supported by RFBR 09-01-00157, SSc 344.2008.1, SB RAS Integration project N 97, and by ADTP "Development of the Scientific Potential of Higher School" of the Russian Federal Agency for Education (Grant 2.1.1.419). The authors are very grateful to Viktor Zhelyabin for helpful discussions and valuable comments.

## References

[1] Albert, A. A. A structure theory for Jordan algebras. *Ann. of Math.* **2** (48) (1947) 546–567.
[2] Bakalov, B., D'Andrea, A., Kac, V. G. Theory of finite pseudoalgebras. *Adv. Math.* **162** (1) (2001) 1–140.
[3] Beilinson, A. A., Drinfeld, V. G. Chiral algebras. *Amer. Math. Soc. Colloquium Publications* **51**, AMS, Providence, RI, 2004.
[4] Bremner, M., Peresi, L. A., Special identities for quasi-Jordan algebras. 2009, preprint.
[5] Ginzburg, V., Kapranov, M., Koszul duality for operads. *Duke Math. J.* **76** (1) (1994) 203–272.
[6] Faulkner, J. R., Barbilian planes. *Geom. Dedicata* **30** (2) (1989) 125–181.
[7] Jacobson, N., *Structure and representations of Jordan algebras.* AMS, Providence, 1968.
[8] Kac, V. G., Vertex Algebras for Beginners. *University Lecture Series* **10**, AMS, Providence, RI, 1996.
[9] Kac, V. G., Formal distribution algebras and conformal algebras. In: *Proc. of XII International Congress in Mathematical Physics (ICMP'97)*, Internat. Press, Cambridge, MA (1999) 80–97.
[10] Kolesnikov, P. S., Identities of conformal algebras and pseudoalgebras. *Comm. Algebra* **34** (6) (2006) 1965–1979.
[11] Kolesnikov, P. S., Varieties of dialgebras and conformal algebras. *Siberian Math. J.* **49** (2) (2008) 257–272.
[12] Kolesnikov, P. S., Simple finite Jordan pseudoalgebras. *SIGMA* **5** (2009) 014, 17 pages, math.QA/0210264.

[13] Lambek, J., Deductive systems and categories II. Standard constructions and closed categories. *Lecture Notes Math.* **86**, 76–122, Springer-Verl., Berlin, 1969.
[14] Liu, D., Steinberg–Leibniz algebras and superalgebras. *J. Algebra* **283** (1) (2005) 199–221.
[15] Loday, J.-L., Une version non commutative des alg'ebres de Lie: les alg'ebres de Leibniz. *Enseign. Math.* **39** (1993) 269–293.
[16] Loday, J.-L., Overview on Leibniz algebras, dialgebras and their homology. In: *Cyclic cohomology and noncommutative geometry* (Waterloo, ON, 1995), 91–102, Fields Inst. Commun., 17, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997.
[17] Loday, J.-L., Dialgebras. In: Dialgebras and Related Operads. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **1763**, pp. 7-66. Springer Verl., Berlin, 2001.
[18] Loday, J.-L., Pirashvili, T. Universal envelopping algebras of Leibniz algebras and homology. *Math. Ann.* **296** (1993) 139–158.
[19] Roitman, M. On free conformal and vertex algebras. *J. Algebra* **217** (2) (1999) 496–527.
[20] Pozhidaev, A. P. 0-Dialgebras with bar-unity, ternary Leibniz algebras and Rota—Baxter algebras. In: A. Giambruno, et al., ed. *Groups, Rings and Group Rings*, to appear.
[21] Velasquez, R., Felipe, R. Quasi-Jordan algebras. *Comm. Algebra* **36** (4) (2008) 1580–1602.
[22] Zel'manov, E. I. Solvability of Jordan nil algebras (Russian). *Trudy Inst. Mat.* (Novosibirsk) **16** (1989) 37–54.
[23] Zelmanov, E. I. On the structure of conformal algebras. In: Proceedings of Intern. Conf. on Combinatorial and Computational Algebra (May 24–29, 1999, Hong Kong) *Contemp. Math.* **264** (2000), 139–153.
[24] Zhevlakov, K. A., Slin'ko, A. M., Shestakov, I. P., Shirshov, A. I. *Rings that are nearly associative.* Academic Press, New York, 1982.

[1]Novosibirsk State University
*E-mail address*: vsevolodgu@mail.ru

[2*]Sobolev Institute of Mathematics
*E-mail address*: pavelsk@math.nsc.ru